

H1762

Approved For Release 1999/09/17 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000200740006-8

February 27, 1967

Thus although the United States was receiving most-favored-nation treatment, that treatment was wholly inadequate from our viewpoint.

The issues of notification and access are unmistakably resolved in the 1964 Consular Convention and its Protocol, which make clear that notification and access must be accorded within four days "from the time of arrest or detention." As you note in your letter, the Secretary has testified that the U.S.S.R. has never before given so specific a guarantee on access.

Ratification of the Consular Convention would bring into force the legal instrument contemplated by the Litvinoff letter as the definitive means for assuring consular protection to American nationals in the Soviet Union. Such rights, Mr. Litvinoff stated, were to be included in a consular convention "to be negotiated immediately following the establishment of relations." No consular convention was concluded, however, until the two countries signed the 1964 Convention now pending before the Senate. We agree with you that its provisions, particularly those dealing with consular notification and access, are very much in our national interest.

If I can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR II,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

Enclosure: Litvinoff letter of November 16, 1933.

WASHINGTON,
November 16, 1933.

Mr. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States of America,
The White House.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Following our conversations I have the honor to inform you that the Soviet Government is prepared to include in a consular convention to be negotiated immediately following the establishment of relations between our two countries provisions in which nationals of the United States shall be granted rights with reference to legal protection which shall not be less favorable than those enjoyed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics by nationals of the nation most favored in this respect. Furthermore, I desire to state that such rights will be granted to American nationals immediately upon the establishment of relations between our two countries.

In this connection I have the honor to call to your attention Article 11 and the Protocol to Article 11, of the Agreement Concerning Conditions of Residence and Business and Legal Protection in General concluded between Germany and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on October 12, 1925.

"ARTICLE 11.

"Each of the Contracting Parties undertakes to adopt the necessary measures to inform the consul of the other Party as soon as possible whenever a national of the country which he represents is arrested in his district.

"The same procedure shall apply if a prisoner is transferred from one place of detention to another.

"FINAL PROTOCOL.

"Ad Article 11

"1. The Consul shall be notified either by a communication from the person arrested or by the authorities themselves direct. Such communications shall be made within a period not exceeding seven times twenty-four hours, and in large towns, including capitals of districts, within a period not exceeding three times twenty-four hours.

"2. In places of detention of all kinds, requests made by consular representatives to visit nationals of their country under arrest, or to have them visited by their representatives, shall be granted without delay. The consular representative shall not be entitled

to require officials of the courts or prisons to withdraw during his interview with the person under arrest."

I am, my dear Mr. President,

Very sincerely yours,

MAXIM LITVINOFF,

People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs,
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

REPRESENTATIVE FORM OF GOVERNMENT FOR VIETNAM

(Mr. FINDLEY (at the request of Mr. GUDE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most encouraging aspects of the struggle in Vietnam is the movement toward a representative and democratic government for the Republic of Vietnam. We have learned through bitter experience that a government which is strongly anti-Communist without itself being representative is hardly an adequate deterrent to Communist subversion.

The strongest defense against Communist subversion is a constitutionally based government which offers political opportunities for all its people.

The progress of South Vietnam toward constitutional government has not always been as certain or as determined as it now is. The most dramatic evidence of the growth of democracy was the recent constituent assembly election. This election, held in a country during a state of war, resulted in 80.8 percent of the registered voters casting their ballots for 532 candidates competing for 117 seats in the Constituent Assembly. This election was in itself dramatic refutation to the claim of the National Liberation Front that it represents a majority of the Vietnamese, because an estimated 56 percent of all Vietnamese of voting age cast ballots at the risk of Vietcong reprisal, demonstrating their determination to develop their own independent political institutions. Despite the large-scale attempts at intimidation, three-fourths of the voting-age population were registered to vote, and four out of every five of those registered voted. This success destroys the NLF's claim that they control two-thirds of the population and are the "sole genuine representatives" of the Vietnamese people.

The attempts of the Vietnamese to build their own political system must necessarily start with a constitution. I have today introduced a concurrent resolution which expresses the full support of Congress for the efforts of the Constituent Assembly now in session to provide for the right of self-determination through a representative form of government for the state of Vietnam.

H. CON. RES. —

Whereas the South Vietnam Constituent Assembly has been formed as a result of recent elections; and

Whereas this Constituent Assembly is preparing a new constitution to provide a basis of freedom for the people of South Vietnam; and

Whereas this Constituent Assembly proposes that all people of the Republic of South Vietnam be permitted to vote for the officials who will govern them; and

Whereas the United States, in the conduct of its foreign affairs, is dedicated to the principle that people everywhere have the right

to determine their own destiny through free participation in the choosing of their government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses its full support of the South Vietnam Constituent Assembly in its efforts to assure all the people of South Vietnam the right of self-determination and the right to choose a representative form of government.

WASHINGTON POST EDITORIAL ON CIA

(Mr. FINDLEY (at the request of Mr. GUDE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House, including myself, have expressed alarm with the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency in assisting financially the activities of various "nongovernmental" organizations including the National Student Association.

The Washington Post on Tuesday, February 21, 1967, had an excellent editorial discussing this subject and pointing out the dangers in this type of activity. Too often we in this country tend to forget that a policy of anticommunism is not enough. Our purpose must be to advance democracy and freedom. Merely containing communism does not mean we have succeeded in establishing democratic governments and preserving freedom. Certainly these two principles cannot exist where there is communism, but neither does the absence of communism guarantee their presence. We must guard carefully against using state tactics to defeat a police state. In defending ourselves and others against our enemies we must be vigilant lest we be swept into adopting the very strategy and tactical devices of our opponents.

The editorial follows:

PREVENTING SUBVERSION

The first object of the President's task force on the Central Intelligence Agency's operations ought to be to devise a system that will make the country's non-governmental professional associations secure against secret, covert and conspiratorial subversion by the Government.

Its first purpose ought to be the preservation of the integrity and independence of the private institutions and agencies whose separate existence distinguishes a free from a totalitarian society. No doubt some of these associations, as the result of CIA financing, have, in the past, made a contribution toward the conduct of American policy abroad. But it is a contribution that they cannot make without diminishing, if not destroying, their larger role in the formation of opinion and the ventilation of criticism of government here at home. For government, in a free society, is not a thing apart from the society it serves—it is a product of society. And its views emerge from the clash of opinion and the storm of controversy. To tamper with the spontaneity of that clash and controversy is to pollute the mainsprings of policy at the source. The various professions, crafts, trades and academic institutions alone can perform this function. Other agencies can be used, by other means, to further national interests at stake in direct competition with our cold war opponents.

The competition for the control of various international professional groups is a political struggle common to our time. Perhaps we cannot escape it. Our opponents in this

struggle have no existence, no policy, no purpose other than that of their governments. They come to this battlefield better financed, better indoctrinated, better coordinated than do our representatives. And so, in the short run, they may win some contests that we would not wish to lose. But few of these battles are of such serious consequence that we can afford to win them by means that imperil the very freedoms we struggle to preserve. And where they are of that importance, and no other alternative is available, open, avowed, admitted and on-the-record governmental support surely would be the best way to accomplish our purposes. It is, in any case, the way that does not hazard the survival of our domestic society in order to win a point in the struggle for the control of international groups.

The full dimensions of the CIA operation are not yet known. What is known indicates that the CIA has been used to channel Federal funds into private groups for the good purpose of contending for the control of many international bodies. That has had a catastrophic effect on the creditability of some of these groups. But so far, no one has suggested a worse misuse of Federal funds that such secrecy might make possible in the future. This power and authority raises a specter of corruption that has alarmed every free people since the Walpole government in Great Britain used its secret funds to corrupt the Parliament itself. It is not alleged that this has happened here—but the almost unrestricted discretion of the CIA to spend what and where it will could be perverted. It ought to appall Americans to know that an agency of their Government (for a good purpose) has prejudiced the independence of private groups important in their intellectual life. Unless appropriate steps are taken, it may appall them even more, at some future time, to discover that such an agency has prejudiced the integrity of private organizations for a bad purpose. Some of the groups already involved have great power in this country. Their favor or opposition, in some cases, is sufficient to determine the death or survival of associated institutions. They could be as useful in fixing the fate of political parties or factions inside the country as they have been useful abroad. And unless the misuse of this kind of concealed subsidy, secret conspiracy and financial corruption is made impossible, this is the kind of rot that will some day appear in this Nation. Now is the time to prevent it by unequivocal, explicit and unmistakable provisions in the law itself that will put these operations under more stringent and more intensive and more continuous review, fixing the responsibility so clearly that no future Congress, no future Administration and no future supervisory board can say that they did not know what was going on.

LETTER TO SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

(Mr. FINDLEY (at the request of Mr. GUDE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, on February 22, I sent a letter to the Secretary of Commerce regarding the reestablishment of the weather station at Burlington, Iowa. I include the letter in full at this point in the RECORD:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 22, 1967.

HON. JOHN T. CONNOR,
Secretary of Commerce,
Department of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Having learned of the tornado which tragically took one per-

son's life and caused injury to many others in Fort Madison, Iowa, I feel it necessary to urge the re-establishment of the weather bureau at Burlington, Iowa. The death, injury, and damage resulting from the tornado could have been prevented if the Burlington weather station had been in operation and, therefore, able to warn citizens of the storm's approach.

Although I represent the 20th District of Illinois, this Iowa weather station was important to my District as it provided weather information, forecasts, and storm warnings for eight west-central Illinois counties. Located as we are, jutting into northeastern Missouri, the weather forecast for western Illinois has often passed us before we've heard about it. We need the pinpointing attention we formerly enjoyed from the Burlington weather bureau for the safety of those threatened by storm and flood, for its value to industry and business, and for personal convenience and general satisfaction.

This part of the Mississippi Valley can generate sudden and erratic switches in the weather that seem independent of the major systems dominating the national picture. This particular area, therefore, needs a special watch. It was promised that the area would be served from Des Moines but last week's tornado demonstrated the inadequacy of that arrangement.

I, therefore, request that you take whatever action may be necessary to re-establish the weather station at Burlington, Iowa. Among the many reasons are:

1. The large area served has been left relatively unprotected.
2. The fact that the station was here, and facilities are still available at the Burlington airport, make it more economical to reactivate the service here, rather than instituting a substitute elsewhere.
3. The forecast record of its 23 years here was one of the best in the country.
4. Forecasting of river stages makes the Burlington site ideal for the area.
5. The IAAP, a major reason for moving the station here in 1941, is operating now at the highest level since World War II.

Thank you so much for your consideration.
Sincerely yours,

PAUL FINDLEY,
Representative in Congress.

PERIL OF DISARMAMENT

(Mr. FINDLEY (at the request of Mr. GUDE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the noted columnist and dean of war correspondents, Edgar Ansel Mowrer, recently accorded richly deserved praise to Congressman CRAIG HOSMER, and at the same time ably summarized the case against the nuclear weapon treaty in the following column:

DISARMAMENT WOULD FREE REDS TO EXPAND FURTHER

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Which is more important to you: uninspected disarmament agreements with the Soviet Union leading to "general and total disarmament" (maybe) or a halt to further communist expansion?

As an American and a voter you should make up your mind quickly for the chances are you cannot have both.

Uninspection disarmament agreements with Moscow, such as those now accepted or desired by the U.S. administration, can save money for antipoverty efforts, more social security, more subsidies apparently required by the Great Society. Yet, contrary to what government spokesmen are saying, they will

not diminish the danger of major nuclear war.

In fact, according to Congressman CRAIG Hosmer, ranking Republican Representative on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, they are largely a hoax. Hosmer knows war first-hand having had active naval service from 1940 to 1946 (unlike so many of our young disarmers who have never heard a shot fired in anger). Moreover, he spent a year in Los Alamos with the Atomic Energy Commission.

Halting further Soviet expansion will cost money—more and more of it, in all likelihood. For we cannot afford to allow the Soviet Union and Red China, separate or together, to surpass us in any vital weapon, as the former has already done in large nuclear warheads and threatens to do with anti-missile missiles.

RACE COSTLY TO REDS

The resulting armament race makes nuclear war so horrendous as to be unlikely. And because of the vastly superior wealth of the United States, the race puts a greater strain on the U.S.S.R. Yet while that country has already surrounded Moscow with anti-missile missiles, the United States has so far done nothing of the kind.

The greater the degree of disarmament reached by both countries, the more the Soviet Union and lesser Red countries will be free to spread the Red blight by all means short of nuclear war, from unlimited propaganda and systematic subversion to more "little wars of liberation," as in Viet Nam.

The American champions of relaxing tensions know this as well as the partisans of military preponderance over the Soviet Union. But the former believe that the danger of the armament race is greater than that of "trusting the Russians."

Therefore after saying for years that it would not, the Administration now seeks, according to Congressman Hosmer, "not only a disarmament treaty . . . but a nonproliferation treaty, a treaty to halt production of fissionable materials for nuclear weapons, a treaty to stop us from building nuclear delivery systems including anti-missile defenses, a treaty to remove fissionable material from existing warheads." In addition it is asking the Senate to ratify the Treaty on Peaceful Uses of Outer Space now—with no built-in possibility of inspection to prevent the Soviet Union "from orbiting nuclear monsters."

PEACE AT A PRICE

The nonproliferation treaty, which is still waiting for Soviet acceptance, would not, according to Hosmer, make for peace. But it would have another and, to my mind, disastrous result. It would divide the world permanently into two nuclear giants, several nuclear pigmies and a mass of totally impotent countries. Acting together, the United States and the Soviet Union could impose anything they wanted upon the rest of the world, including our real friends at least, until the world accepted "general and total disarmament."

Any such dyarchy would be particularly intolerable to one-time great powers like Britain, Germany, France and Japan.

Moreover, so long as the Soviet Union practices party tyranny and terror at home and promotes aggression abroad, it will remain capable of treachery toward the United States. Nor can I believe that those dwindling Americans who still believe human freedom to be the highest good, will be willing to share world rule with double-talking Bolsheviks.

For these reasons I disapprove of any form of disarmament even with inspection that is not accompanied by political changes in communist countries. What freedom needs is not a loosening of our alliances but their consolidation into an overwhelming bloc impervious to Moscow's divisive actions and deceptive talk of "peaceful coexistence."